DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 001 HE 024 821

AUTHOR Beeler, Karl J.; And Others
TITLE Campus Safety: A Survey of Administrative Perceptions and Strategies.
INSTITUTION National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 44p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1875 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 418, Washington, DC 20009-5728 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Campuses; *Crime; Crime Prevention; Dormitories; Group Experience; Higher Education; Lighting; Safety Education; *School Security; Security Personnel

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the findings of a 1990 nationwide survey of chief student affairs administrators addressing college and university campus safety issues. Respondents (N=701 out of a total of 1,091 recipients) completed a 24 item questionnaire, and the results were analyzed using frequencies and cross-tabulations for comparisons by size of enrollment, location of campus, type of campus, and size of residence hall system. Results indicated that most colleges and universities provide security foot patrols and vehicle patrols, student escort services and, to a lesser degree, emergency telephones around campus. At institutions with residence halls, safety education/awareness programs are common. The study also found that factors of institutional size, campus location and residential culture influence security and safety. Finally, the report categorizes successful safety programs in five ways: traditional services (campus police, patrols, student-staffed security programs etc.); education and support programs (from general security precautions to in-depth crime victim advocacy); planning, policy, and information strategies (crime reports, safety studies and review, research, and broad based intervention); environmental and technological modifications (construction, landscaping, and electronic technologies); and community action groups. The data are detailed in tables with explanatory notes. A copy of the survey instrument is included in Appendix A. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336001

Campus Safety:

A Survey of Administrative Perceptions and Strategies

Spring 1991

Karl J. Beeler, University of Missouri-St.Louis
Susan Dunton Bellandese, University of Connecticut
Carol A. Wiggins, University of Connecticut

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NASPA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 024 821

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.

Until June 1, 1991:
1700 18th Street, NW
Suite 301
Washington, DC 20009-2508

After June 1, 1991:
1875 Connecticut Ave., NW
Suite 418
Washington, DC 20009-5728

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1990-1991 NASPA Research and Program Development Division Members

Carol Wiggins, Director
University of Connecticut

Peter Baigent
Syracuse University

Karl Beeler
University of Missouri-St. Louis

Val Christensen
Utah State University

Alan Cureton
Sterling College

Kristine Dillon
University of Southern California

Randy Hyman
Ball State University

L. Sandy MacLean
University of Missouri-St. Louis

Dewaine Rice
Memphis State University

Daniel Robinson
Iowa State University

Sharyn Slavin
University of Southern California

Mark von Destinon
University of Arizona

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Tables. iv

Executive Summary. v

Introduction 1

Method 2

Instrument 2

Data Analysis. 2

Campus Safety Reporting Lines. 4

Security Staff 4

Maintaining Campus Crime Statistics. 6

Increased Concern about Campus Safety. 8

Media Contact. 8

Need for Improvement 8

Adequacy of Funding. 8

General Ratings of Campus Safety 10

Presence of Selected Safety Services 12

Adequacy of Lighting 12

Presence of Residence Hall Safety Features 14

Administrative Procedures for Addressing Selected Problems 16

Campus-based Studies of Campus Safety. 18

State Legislation Regarding Reporting of Campus Crime Statistics 20

Will Legislation Lead to Improvements in Campus Safety? 20

Effective Strategies for Improving Campus Safety 21

Appendix A (Survey Instrument) 25

Table of Tables

Table #		Page
1.	Comparison Categories Used in the Report.	3
2.	Reporting Lines of Campus Safety/Security Department	5
3.	Campus Crime Reporting Practices.	7
4.	Measures of Concern Regarding Campus Safety	9
5.	Safety Ratings of Selected Campus and Off-campus Locations.	11
6.	Presence of Selected Safety Services.	13
7.	Presence of Selected Safety Features.	15
8.	Presence of Administrative Procedures for Dealing with Selected Safety Problems	17
9.	Status of Studies of Campus Safety.	19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

* Two-thirds of all NASPA member institutions participated in this study of campus safety and security. This paper reports the findings for the total respondent group of 701 colleges and universities, and provides comparisons by size of enrollment, location of campus (urban, suburban, or rural), type of campus (commuter or residential), and size of residence hall system.

* Respondents from nearly every college and university indicated that their campuses are reasonably or very safe. However, four-fifths agreed that campus safety needs improvement, and most said a study of campus safety is underway or was completed in the past five years.

* Most institutions have experienced significant increased concern about campus safety and most have been contacted by the media about campus safety in the past twelve months. Barely half agree that funding is adequate to ensure safety at their schools.

* A large majority of colleges and universities maintain campus crime statistics and make them readily available to interested parties. Although respondents from twenty states said legislation is pending or on record in their states regarding the reporting of campus crime statistics, few believe that such legislation will lead to significant improvements in campus safety.

* Libraries, academic buildings, and residence halls are considered safer places than constructed pathways or parking lots. Fraternities and sororities, local off-campus apartments, and neighborhoods adjacent to campus are the least safe, according to respondents.

* Lighting around residence halls and other campus buildings is considered adequate at a great majority of institutions. Lighting in parking areas and along pathways is considered adequate at fewer campuses, although these still comprise a solid majority.

* Most colleges and universities provide security foot patrols and security vehicle patrols, student escort services and, to a lesser degree, emergency telephones around campus. Most have administrative procedures for dealing with alcohol/drug abuse, sexual assault (including acquaintance rape) and safety education.

* At institutions with residence halls, safety education/awareness programs are common. Most residences have outside doors that lock automatically, but few have electronic alarms to warn of propped doors. Less than half keep registration logs of non-resident guests entering the residence halls. Less than a third install security screens on ground level windows or provide outside security phones at entrance doors for delivery calls.

* Factors of institutional size, campus location, and residential culture influence security and safety from one campus to another. The types of safety programs, features, and services offered vary according to the specific campus environment.

* Successful safety programs and initiatives may be categorized in at least five ways: traditional services; education and support programs; planning, policy and information strategies; environmental and technological modifications; and community action.

  Traditional services include campus police organizations, campus patrols, student-staffed security programs, security services, outreach programs, prevention or response services, and security technology/communications.

  Education and support programs range from general security precautions to in-depth crime victim advocacy and support services. Orientation periods, class meetings, residence hall settings, and symposia are a few of the settings for delivery of these programs.

  Planning, policy, and information strategies focus on crime reports, safety studies and reviews, research, and broad-based intervention. Safety information is used to guide administrative decision-making and to enhance campus awareness.

  Environmental and technological modifications are designed to minimize the chances that campus crimes will occur, by reducing the number of places where crime is likely to be fostered. Construction and landscaping is designed accordingly, and electronic technologies (telephones, computers, cameras, card access) are applied in service of safety.

  Community action groups seek to enhance safety through the power of individual involvement. On- and off-campus constituents often collaborate to raise community awareness and to ensure that other safety strategies result in tangible improvements in campus safety.

INTRODUCTION

Campus safety and security are matters that concern college and university administrators, faculty, students, parents and, most recently, politicians. In the past few years, the highly publicized murders of several students have spawned ongoing media investigations and focused national attention on campus crime. The general safety of postsecondary campuses has been called into question, along with security measures taken by campus officials and practices related to the reporting of campus crime statistics. At least twenty states are considering or have enacted legislation regarding the reporting of campus crime statistics.

All of this activity has spawned renewed interest in examining and improving safety on our campuses. Much discussion has ensued about effective ways to deter campus crime, and many "experts" have propitiously emerged. However, little effort has been made to garner opinion or study safety practices by asking student affairs administrators about their campuses. The chief student affairs officers at American colleges and universities are the officials who most frequently receive calls or letters from concerned parties, and most often are the individuals expected to "do something" when the safety and security of college students is seriously questioned.

The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, through its Research and Program Development Division, has completed a nationwide survey of campus safety by contacting the chief student affairs administrator at each of the NASPA member institutions. It is hoped that the study's findings, contained herein, will add to the knowledge base and lead to more practical ways of addressing and improving safety and security on all postsecondary campuses.

Marsha Duncan of Lehigh University, 1990-91 NASPA President, identified the need for a NASPA-sponsored study of campus safety and directed the Research and Program Development Division to complete a related survey. Carol Wiggins of The University of Connecticut, Director of the R&PD Division, assigned the task to her research staff and participated in various phases of the survey design and instrumentation. Karl Beeler of the University of Missouri-St. Louis, a member of R&PD, organized and directed all phases of the data collecting, data analysis, and report writing. Susan Dunton Bellandese of The University of Connecticut provided the summary analysis of effective strategies for improving campus safety.

Method

In October 1990 a questionnaire regarding campus safety was mailed to each of the 1,091 voting delegates of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, representing all fifty states, the District of Columbia, and six Canadian provinces.

Instrument

A twenty-four item questionnaire was developed by members of the NASPA Research and Program Development Division, in collaboration with campus safety officials, selected NASPA members and members of the NASPA Board of Directors. The questionnaire (Appendix A) was designed to collect data on general perceptions of campus safety, management structure, crime reporting practices, and campus safety features and services. The survey also asked about in-house safety studies pending or completed, state legislation, adequacy of safety funding, and sense of institutional concern. Finally, the questionnaire asked for a short description of campus safety programs or initiatives deemed successful.

Data Analysis

A total of 726 completed questionnaires were returned, for a participation rate of 67 percent. No attempt was made to send a follow-up mailing to non-respondents. Of the 726 surveys received back, 701 were usable for statistical analysis.

Frequencies and crosstabulations were the primary statistical procedures used to analyze the data. The statistics reported throughout this document are, for reasons of practicality, limited to the percentage of respondents.

Percentages are reported for the overall set of respondents (N=701) and for selected comparison groups according to enrollment, location, and type of campus (commuter versus predominantly residential). Responses to the question on residence hall safety features are compared by size of residence hall system. The comparison groups are listed in Table 1 with the number of respondents for each category.

Table 1. Comparison Categories Used in the Report

Category	Number	Percent
Overall		
Questionnaires Returned	726	66.5
Questionnaires Used in Data Analysis	701	96.6
Size of Enrollment		
Small (less than 2,000 headcount)	207	30.3
Medium (2,000 - 9,999 headcount)	278	40.7
Large (10,000 or more headcount)	198	29.0
Location of Campus		
Urban	240	37.5
Suburban	208	32.5
Rural	192	30.0
Type of Campus*		
Commuter (no students reside on campus)	121	17.3
Residential (50% or more reside on campus)	175	25.0
Other (less than 50% reside on campus)	405	57.7
Size of Residence Hall System		
Small (less than 1,000 students)	222	38.8
Medium (1,000 - 1,999 students)	151	26.4
Large (2,000 or more students)	199	34.8

* The "commuter" category includes only institutions with no students residing on the campus. The "residential" category includes only institutions which have 50 percent or more of their students living on campus. These exclusive categories were chosen in order to study the differences between totally commuter campuses and predominantly residential campuses. Most campuses (n=405) do not fit into either category because the proportion of students residing on these campuses falls below 50 percent.

Campus Safety Reporting Lines

Most campus safety/security departments report to a division other than Student Affairs. The majority report to Administrative Affairs (55%) or related departments with such titles as Business, Finance, Physical Plant, and Operations (20%). Less than one in four (23%) report to Student Affairs. A small proportion (2%) reports directly to the President's Office.

Safety departments at rural campuses (30%) are twice as likely as those in urban locations (15%) to report to Student Affairs.

Safety departments in predominantly residential institutions (34%) are nearly three times as likely as those in commuter schools (12%) to report to Student Affairs.

Security Staff

Over half (52%) of the schools responding indicated they employ a professional police force to manage security on campus. About a third employ private security guards (31%) or a para-professional staff that often includes students (37%). These percentages exceed 100% because many campuses use a combination of professionals and paraprofessionals to monitor safety conditions and respond to security needs and emergencies. Students (paid or volunteer) sometimes serve as the "eyes and ears" of the campus in places that are difficult or impractical for professionals to patrol or monitor.

Table 2. Reporting Lines of Campus Security/Safety Department by Enrollment, Location, and Type of Institution (Percent Responding by Category of Institution)

	Enrollment			Location			Type		
Indicator	Small < 2000	Medium 2000-9999	Large 10000+	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Commuter	Resi-dential	All (Ranked)
Administrative Affairs	46	57	61	60	52	52	61	44	55
Student Affairs	29	26	13	15	24	30	12	34	23
Other*	24	15	23	23	21	17	21	21	20
President	1	2	4	2	3	1	7	1	2

*Examples: Business, Finance, Physical Plant, Operations, Human Resources/Personnel.

Maintaining Campus Crime Statistics

Eighty-five percent of the institutions reporting said they maintain campus crime statistics. Of these schools, three out of four (77%) said the statistics are consistent with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) specifications.

Asked whether these statistics are available to interested persons, most (52%) indicated they are available but only on request. Another third of the schools (34%) said these statistics are published and widely available. A small proportion (5%) said they are available under other conditions. Only one in ten (9%) responded that their campus crime statistics are simply not available to interested persons.

Small colleges (67%) are less likely than their counterparts to maintain campus crime statistics. Those that do are less likely to collect data which are consistent with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting specifications (51%). Small colleges that do collect crime statistics are less likely than larger schools to publish and make them widely available (16%).

Table 3. Campus Crime Reporting Practices by Enrollment, Location, and Type of Institution

Indicator	Enrollment			Location			Type		All (Ranked)
	Small < 2000	Medium 2000-9999	Large 10000+	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Commuter	Resi-dential	
Does your institution maintain campus crime statistics? (Yes)	67	90	98	88	89	78	78	81	85
Are these statistics available to interested persons?									
Yes, they are available but ONLY on request	59	56	41	54	52	48	69	51	52
Yes, they are published and widely available	16	32	51	33	33	38	16	28	34
No	16	9	3	8	10	6	10	13	9
Other	8	3	5	5	4	8	5	8	5
Are these statistics consistent with FBI Uniform Crime Report (UCR) specifications? (Yes)	51	78	94	79	78	74	73	60	77

Increased Concern About Campus Safety

Most respondents (57%) reported that their institutions had experienced significant increased concern about campus safety in the past 12 months.

Large universities (64%) and urban institutions (60%) were somewhat more likely than their smaller and more rural counterparts to have experienced increased concern. Predominantly residential colleges (57%) were more likely than commuter schools (43%) to have experienced increased concern about campus safety.

Media Contact

Most colleges and universities (57%) had been contacted by members of the press, TV or radio media about campus safety in the previous 12 months.

Only a third of small colleges had been contacted (33%), compared to medium-sized (58%) or large institutions (81%).

Interestingly, only a third (33%) of the commuter schools had been contacted, compared to nearly half (49%) of the predominantly residential institutions.

Need for Improvement

Fully 82 percent of the respondents said they believe campus safety needs improvement at their own institutions. Respondents at commuter institutions (72%) were somewhat less likely than those at predominantly residential colleges and universities (88%) to have indicated the need for improvement.

Adequacy of Funding

Barely half (52%) of the respondents were of the opinion that funding was adequate to ensure safety at their institutions.

Table 4. Measures of Concern Regarding Campus Safety
by Enrollment, Location, and Type of Institution
(Percent Responding "Yes" to Each Indicator)

	Enrollment			Location			Type		
Indicator	Small < 2000	Medium 2000-9999	Large 10000+	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Commuter	Resi-dential	All (Ranked)
Do you believe campus safety needs improvement at your own institution?	86	76	87	81	83	84	72	88	82
Have you been contacted by the press, TV or radio about campus safety in past 12 months?	33	58	81	62	54	49	33	49	57
Has your institution experienced significant increased concern about campus safety in past 12 months?	52	56	64	60	56	53	43	47	57
In your opinion, is funding adequate to ensure safety at your institution?	50	55	51	56	52	50	56	52	52

General Ratings of Campus Safety

Respondents estimated how safe their own institutions are in general, and how safe each of eight other areas is, on and off of the campus grounds. Almost all respondents (97%) rated the overall safety of their campuses as reasonably safe or very safe.

Similarly high proportions estimated as reasonably or very safe the library (98%), residence halls (96%), and academic building (96%).

High proportions also rated as reasonably or very safe the constructed pathways on campus (88%) and parking areas (85%) on campus.

About three-fourths of the respondents rated fraternities/sororities (78%), local off-campus apartments (75%), and neighborhoods adjacent to campus (72%) as reasonably or very safe. However, respondents from large universities and urban institutions rated off-campus apartments and neighborhoods adjacent to campus less safe than did respondents from smaller or more rural institutions.

Table 5. Safety Ratings of Selected Campus and Off-Campus Locations by Enrollment, Location, and Type of Institution (Percent Estimating Location as "Reasonably safe" or "Very safe")

	Enrollment			Location			Type		
Indicator	Small < 2000	Medium 2000-9999	Large 10000+	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Commuter	Resi-dential	All (Ranked)
Library	98	99	97	99	98	96	98	99	98
Residence halls	93	96	99	98	94	95	--	--	96
Academic buildings	95	96	97	98	95	94	98	95	96
Constructed pathways	83	89	90	90	87	87	85	88	88
Parking areas	83	86	87	86	86	85	83	89	85
Fraternities/ sororities	80	83	75	80	76	81	91	85	78
Local off-campus apts.	82	77	68	64	82	87	79	82	75
Neighborhoods, adjacent to campus	79	71	67	53	82	90	66	78	72
Overall campus safety	95	98	99	97	97	98	96	96	97

Presence of Selected Safety Services

Respondents were asked whether selected safety services were offered on their campuses. Nine out of ten reported that they provide foot patrols by police or other security personnel (90%) and police/security vehicle patrols of campus (87%). Two-thirds provide student escort services (67%), and most have emergency telephones around campus (56%). Campus transportation is available at more than a third of the campuses (36%).

In general, the larger institutions are more likely to provide each of these services.

The more urban the school, the more likely that escort services and campus transportation is provided.

With the exception of emergency telephones around campus, each of these services is more likely to be found on predominantly residential campuses than on totally commuter campuses.

Adequacy of Lighting

Lighting is considered adequate by about two-thirds of the respondents in each of the following areas: around campus buildings other than residence halls (70%); in all parking areas (64%); and on all constructed pathways (62%).

Table 6. Presence of Selected Safety Services by Enrollment, Location, and Type of Institution
(Percent Responding "Yes" for Each Service)

	Enrollment			Location			Type		
Indicator	Small < 2000	Medium 2000-9999	Large 10000+	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Commuter	Residential	All (Ranked)
On foot campus patrols by police or other security	89	88	94	91	93	87	84	91	90
Police/security vehicles patrols of campus	74	88	99	84	91	88	74	86	87
Student escort services	55	63	87	76	67	56	52	70	66
Emergency telephones around campus	38	55	77	58	61	49	49	49	56
Campus transportation	23	31	58	43	37	29	18	41	36

Presence of Residence Hall Safety Features

Respondents at all residential institutions, regardless of the size of the residence hall system, were asked to estimate what proportion of the residence halls have selected safety conditions or features.

Over ninety percent (91%) of the respondents reported having adequate lighting around most or all residence halls.

More than four-fifths (84%) reported having safety education/awareness programs in most or all residence halls. These are more likely to be found at institutions with large residence hall systems.

Nearly three-fourths (72%) said that most or all residence halls have outside doors that lock automatically. Such doors are more likely to be found in large residence hall systems and in urban settings.

About half (51%) of the respondents said that routine patrols of interior hallways by police or other security personnel are made in most or all residence halls.

Less than half (42%) of the institutions reporting said that registration logs are kept on non-resident guests entering the residence halls, for most or all of the halls. Residence systems on urban campuses are more likely to use registration logs than those in suburban or rural locations.

Less than a third (30%) reported that, in most or all residence halls, security screens are installed on windows that are accessible from the ground level. Large institutions and urban institutions are the most likely to install security screens.

Less than a third (29%) of the respondents indicated that most or all residence halls have outside access doors with electronic alarms to warn of propped doors.

Less than a third (29%) of the respondents said that most or all residence halls have exterior telephones at the entrance doors for delivery calls. Large institutions and those in urban settings are more likely to have these exterior telephones.

Only one in ten (10%) of the institutions were reported to have professionally trained security personnel stationed at main entrances 24 hours, in most or all residence halls. Urban institutions are three to four times as likely to have this service as their suburban and rural counterparts.

Table 7. Presence of Selected Safety Features by Size, Location of Residence System
(Percent of Institution Reporting the Presence of Safety Features for "Most" or All Residence Halls)

	Size of Residence Hall System			Location			
Safety Feature:	Small < 1000	Medium 1000-1999	Large 2000+	Urban	Suburban	Rural	All (Ranked)
Adequate lighting around residence halls	86	92	94	92	89	90	91
Safety education/awareness programs	69	88	95	88	82	80	84
Outside doors that lock automatically	66	72	78	79	73	62	72
Routine patrols of interior hallways by police or other security personnel	48	49	57	52	52	46	51
Registration logs on non-resident guests entering residence halls	42	38	44	54	37	34	42
Security screens installed on ground level windows	23	36	33	38	28	19	30
Outside access doors with electronic alarms to warn of propped doors	29	28	30	31	31	23	29
Exterior telephone at entrance doors for delivery calls	22	30	38	38	29	22	29
Professionally trained security at main entrances 24 hours	8	9	11	19	6	5	10

Administrative Procedures for Addressing Selected Problems

Respondents were asked whether their institutions had specific administrative procedures for dealing with selected problems commonly associated with campus safety.

Nearly all respondents (97%) indicated they have specific administrative procedures for dealing with alcohol/drug abuse.

A very high proportion (88%) said their institutions have specific administrative procedures for dealing with sexual assault. Predominantly residential campuses are more likely than commuter institutions to have such procedures in place.

Three out of four (77%) respondents reported that specific administrative procedures for dealing with safety education were in place at their institutions. Predominantly residential campuses are more likely than commuter schools to have safety education procedures.

Almost three-fourths (71%) of the schools reported that they have administrative procedures for dealing with sexual assault related specifically to acquaintance rape. Again, predominantly residential colleges and universities are more likely than commuter campuses to have these procedures.

Table 8. Presence of Administrative Procedures for Dealing with Selected Safety Problems by Enrollment, Location, and Type of Institution

Indicator	Enrollment			Location			Type		All (Ranked)
	Small < 2000	Medium 2000-9999	Large 10000+	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Commuter	Resi-dential	
Alcohol/drug abuse	97	98	97	97	97	97	97	98	97
Sexual Assault	84	89	90	87	90	86	76	94	88
Safety education	71	81	80	79	77	75	54	83	77
Sexual assault related to acquaintance rape	70	69	75	69	73	71	40	83	71

Campus-based Studies of Campus Safety

The participants were asked whether their colleges or universities had ever undertaken a study of campus safety. Only fourteen percent indicated that a study is presently planned or underway. Large universities, urban institutions, and commuter schools are more likely than others to be studying campus safety at the present time.

The largest proportion of schools (43%) said a study of campus safety was completed in the past five years. Medium-sized and large institutions, as well as suburban campuses and predominantly residential colleges, are more likely to have completed a study of campus safety in the past five years.

More than a third of the participants (37%) indicated that to their knowledge no study of campus safety has ever been done at their institutions. Small colleges and rural colleges were more likely to give this response, as were commuter institutions.

A small proportion of institutions (6%) reported that the last study of campus safety was completed more than five years ago.

Table 9. Status of Studies of Campus Safety by Enrollment, Location, and Type of Institution
(Percent Responding "Yes" to Each Category)

	Enrollment			Location			Type		
Indicator	Small < 2000	Medium 2000-9999	Large 10000+	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Commuter	Resi-dential	All (Ranked)
A study was completed within past 5 years	35	45	49	44	51	36	23	45	43
No study has ever been done	49	33	29	33	32	45	55	38	37
A study is presently planned or underway	11	14	17	18	12	11	18	10	14
Last study completed more than 5 years ago	5	8	5	6	5	8	3	6	6

State Legislation Regarding Reporting of Campus Crime Statistics

Sixty-one percent of the respondents, representing twenty states, reported that legislation was being considered or was on record in their states regarding the reporting of campus crime statistics. These states included California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. In several other states there was apparently some confusion at the time of this survey about the status of such state legislation. The states where disagreement among the respondents was apparent included Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, and New Hampshire.

Will Legislation Lead to Improvements in Campus Safety?

Participants were asked whether they believe state or federal legislation requiring standardized reporting of campus crime statistics will lead to significant improvements in campus safety. Only a third (35%) of the respondents indicated that they believe such legislation will lead to significant improvements.

EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING CAMPUS SAFETY

The last item of the questionnaire asked participants to describe successful safety programs or initiatives currently in place on their campuses. A qualitative review of the responses revealed five categories of safety and security efforts: traditional services; education and support programs; planning, policy, and information strategies; environmental and technological modifications; and community action. Each of these themes is described below and is followed by a representative set of examples. This analysis does not reflect occurrence rates or percentages; rather, it is a general overview of the range and diversity of safety and security measures presently found on college and university campuses nationwide.

Traditional Services

Typically, postsecondary campuses employ safety and security personnel to manage campus law enforcement functions. Services range from campus-based professional police departments to contracted outside security agencies. On many campuses the historical "nightwatch" function has evolved into a highly developed crime prevention program. The following list provides a sample of these traditional services, many of which have developed "new twists" in order to address contemporary campus needs.

- Academy-trained officers with full law enforcement authority
  - Public safety officers
  - Crime prevention officers
  - Crime awareness response officers
  - Residence hall entrance security guards
- Foot, vehicle, bicycle and horse-mounted patrols
- Student employee programs
  - Escort services
  - Uniformed student patrols with radios, lights
- Security services
  - Bicycle registration
  - Weapons registration and storage
  - Engraving programs to mark personal belongings
  - Identification Lab
- Traffic services programs
  - Shuttle bus services and escort vans
  - Safe rides to deter drunk driving
- Outreach programs
  - Open dialogues with police, students, and staff
- Prevention or response services
  - Visitor pass systems
  - Overnight guest pass programs
  - Victim support services
- Security technology/telecommunications
  - 911 emergency telephone systems
  - State of the art security hardware applications

Education and Support Programs

Questionnaire responses also reflected a variety of education and support methods designed to enhance awareness of campus safety and provide victims with needed assistance. Program descriptions ranged from general security precautions to in-depth crime victim advocacy and support services. These types of programs are variously delivered by trained professional and paraprofessional staff including police officers, campus psychologists, educational programmers, and students involved in peer education systems.

Programs are sometimes offered to the campus community during classes, in residence hall settings, and in symposiums. Many institutions reported that safety and security concerns are addressed during orientation programs for new students and families as well as for new employees. Three institutions noted that their campus programs on crime prevention had received state or national recognition.

Sample Programs

Safety Awareness/General Crime Prevention Programs
McGruff Program (modeled after national program)
Friendly Officer Programs to enhance police/community relations
Child Fingerprinting Workshop
Kid Cop Carnival
Vacation Safety
Fraud and Con Games Awareness
Vandalism Prevention
Assertiveness Training (victim oriented)
Fire/Life Safety Programs
Safe Winter Driving Seminar
Educational Sessions on Sexual Assault/Acquaintance Rape
Streetwise
Awareness weeks
Alcohol/drug awareness programs
Whistle distribution programs

Planning, Policy and Information Strategies

Respondents indicated that planning, policy, and information play important roles in campus safety initiatives. Concern for campus safety often sparks administrative activity that results in campus safety policies and plans. Studies, research, and reviews, are needed to inform those persons who are responsible for broad-based planning. Information on actual crimes, on ways to prevent or discourage crime, and on institutional efforts to enhance safety are shared with the campus community in a variety of ways.

Planning and Policy Activities
- Campus safety policies and procedures
- Safety studies
- Construction plan reviews
- Presidential level security policies
- Substance abuse policies
- Policy and procedure reviews
- Five year action plans
- Campus safety audits

Information
- Safety alerts (e.g. posting signs where crimes had occurred)
- Campus crime bulletins (e.g. sharing information on the occurrence of a crime to enhance community awareness)
- Crime line publications (monthly)
- Crime line telephone systems for crime information updates
- Campus newspaper reporting
  - Crime logs
  - Safety awareness feature stories
  - New media safety tips
  - Reporting of crime statistics over time
- Safety notices, pamphlets, table top tents, posters (Crime 101) notification networks, bulletin boards (Alert Board), newsletters, parking lot notices

Environmental and Technological Modifications

Clearly, college and university officials have learned to fight campus crime by creating or modifying the physical environment, and by applying electronic technology to enhance monitoring, surveillance and communication. Often the campus can be made safer simply by reducing the number of areas where crimes would otherwise go undetected.

Environmental Modifications
- Safety reviews and recommendations of construction plans
- Lighting and landscape surveys
- Improved lighting standards and concepts
- Landscape trimming
- Construction of campus access gates and stations
- Installation of security screens on ground floor windows
- Traffic surveys for pedestrian safety

Technological Modifications
- Emergency telephones located at bus stops, in academic buildings, and at other strategic safety areas
- Emergency call boxes
  - Blue light phones
  - Security pager systems
  - Radio communication on net with local authorities

Residence hall computer monitored door locking/alarm systems
Building intrusion monitoring systems
Camera surveillance in strategic areas
Electronic monitoring devices and radios
Card access systems for building and residence hall entry
Elevator emergency systems with police connections

Community Action

Some colleges and universities emphasize collaborative campus-wide community action. The general purpose of the community action group is to make a difference through the power of human involvement. Typically the focus is on volunteerism involving on-campus and off-campus constituents alike. This innovative approach draws upon and pulls together many aspects of other strategies (traditional services: education and support programs; environmental and technological modifications; and planning, policy, and information strategies). Presumably, community action programs have their greatest impact on campus safety when they are successful in raising community awareness, and when they bring together diverse elements in service of tangible results.

Campus watch programs (e.g. Campus Crime Busters, Neighborhood Watch)
Liaison programs with Greek organizations
Campus committees
    Rape awareness and education
    Campus safety
    Police Advisory Board (student leaders)
Projects in conjunction with local community agencies
Task forces
    Residence hall
Personal safety action teams
President's annual security retreat

APPENDIX A

Survey Instrument

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS
Research and Program Development Division

Campus Safety Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS

For each question please indicate your response by circling the appropriate choice, checking an item, or filling in the blank. Please respond to all items. Data will be aggregated in a manner which will prevent identification of individual respondents.

Organization and Administration

1. To whom does the campus security/safety department report at your institution? (Check one.)

   ___ Student affairs/services
   ___ Administrative affairs/services
   ___ President's office
   ___ Other (specify)

2. How is security managed on your campus? (Check all that apply and indicate full-time equivalent [FTE] numbers of staff.)

		FTE
___	Professional police force	_____
___	Private security guards	_____
___	Para-professional staff	_____
___	Other (specify)	

3. Has your institution ever undertaken a study of campus safety? (Check only one.)

   ___ A study is presently planned or underway.
   ___ A study was completed within the past five years.
   ___ The last study was completed more than five years ago.
   ___ No study has ever been done, to my knowledge.

Legislation and Funding

4. Y N Is legislation on record or pending in your state regarding the reporting of campus crime statistics?

5. Y N Is legislation on record or pending in your state regarding the filing of campus security plans?

6. Y N In your opinion, is funding adequate to ensure safety at your institution?

Sense of Urgency

7. Y N Has your institution experienced significant increased concern about campus safety in the past 12 months?

8. Y N Have you been contacted by members of the press, TV or radio media about campus safety in the past 12 months?

9. Y N Do you believe campus safety needs improvement at your own institution?

10. Y N Do you believe state or federal legislation requiring standardized reporting of campus crime statistics will lead to significant improvements in campus safety?

Residence Halls

If your campus does NOT have residence halls SKIP to "Parking Areas and Pathways."

11. Please estimate what proportion of the residence halls at your institution have the following safety features. (Circle the appropriate choice.)

	None	Some	Most	All
a. Professionally trained security personnel stationed at main entrances 24 hours	0	1	2	3
b. Exterior telephones at entrance doors for delivery calls	0	1	2	3
c. Registration logs on non-resident guests entering the residence halls	0	1	2	3
d. Outside access doors that lock automatically	0	1	2	3
e. Outside access doors with electronic alarms to warn of propped doors	0	1	2	3
f. Security screens installed on windows that are accessible from the ground level	0	1	2	3
g. Routine patrols of interior residence hallways by police or other security personnel	0	1	2	3
h. Safety education/awareness programs	0	1	2	3
i. Adequate lighting around residence halls	0	1	2	3

Parking Areas and Pathways

12. Y N Do police or other security personnel conduct regular foot patrols of campus?

13. Y N Is lighting adequate in all parking areas?

14. Y N Is lighting adequate on all constructed pathways?

15. Y N Is lighting adequate around campus buildings other than residence halls?

Crime Reporting

16. Y N Does your institution maintain campus crime statistics? If YES

a. Are these statistics available to interested persons? (Check only one.)

__ No
__ Yes, they are published and widely available
__ Yes, they are available but ONLY on request
__ Other (specify)

b. Are these statistics consistent with the FBI Uniform Crime Report (UCR) specifications?

__ Yes
__ No

Campus Safety Services

17. Does your institution offer the following safety services? (Check the appropriate choice for each.)

	No	Yes, at night only	Yes, 24 hours
a. Student escort services	____	____	____
b. Campus transportation	____	____	____
c. Emergency telephones around campus	____	____	____
d. On foot campus patrols by police or other security personnel	____	____	____
e. Police/security vehicle patrols of campus	____	____	____

Administrative Procedures

18. Does your institution have specific administrative procedures for dealing with each of the following areas?

a. Y N Alcohol/drug abuse

b. Y N Sexual assault

c. Y N Sexual assault related specifically to acquaintance rape

d. Y N Safety education of students

General Safety Ratings

19. Please estimate how safe your institution is in each of the following areas (Circle the appropriate number.)

	Very unsafe	Somewhat unsafe	Reasonably safe	Very safe	Not Applicable
a. Residence halls	0	1	2	3	4
b. Academic buildings	0	1	2	3	4
c. Library	0	1	2	3	4
d. Parking areas	0	1	2	3	4
e. Constructed pathways	0	1	2	3	4
f. Fraternities/sororities	0	1	2	3	4
g. Neighborhoods adjacent to campus	0	1	2	3	4
h. Local off-campus apartments	0	1	2	3	4
i. Overall campus safety	0	1	2	3	4

Demographic Data

20. _____ Number of students enrolled (Fall 1990 Total Headcount)

21. _____ Number of students residing on campus

22. Please describe your institution. (Check the appropriate choices.)

    a. ___Commuter ___Residential

    b. ___Urban _ ___Suburban ___Rural

    c. ___Single sex ___Co-educational

    d. ___2 year ___4 year ___Proprietary

23. _____Please fill in your state, province, or district (e.g., NY, Quebec, DC)

Effective Programs

24. We want to learn more about "tried and true" campus safety programs or initiatives, particularly those which make use of environmental modifications or campus community education. Please use this space to describe programs or initiatives which are already in place and for which you have documented evidence of success. (Attach additional sheets or supporting documents as needed.)

Thank you. Please return the completed questionnaire to:

Dr. Karl Beeler
Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
University of Missouri-St. Louis
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, MO 63121-4499

10/90